THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GODA RAGHURAM.

WRIT PETITON NO.2136 OF 2001.

DATE: 08-09-2005.

Between:

K.Anil Kumar, s/o Govind Rao,

Aged about 47 years, Occ: Unemployee,

Staff No.E.87621, R/o V & M Makloor;

Dist.Nizamabad.

… Petitioner

A n d

The Depot Manager,

APSRTC, Nizamabad and **2 others**

…. Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GODA RAGHURAM

WRIT PETITON NO.2136 OF 2001.

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner was a conductor in the service of the APSRTC since January 1979. From 18-01-1985 onwards, he was not permitted to perform his duties and was neither served with posting orders nor with any orders terminating his service. No enquiry was either conducted. After making numerous representations and to no avail, the petitioner filed a claim under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 being I.D.No.143 of 1996 before the Labour Court II, Hyderabad. According to the counter-affidavit filed by the APSRTC in

the Labour Court, the petitioner was chronically irregular in attending to his duties at the several depots he was posted to and by proceedings of the Divisional Manager, Nizamabad, dated 23-01-1985 the petitioner was posted to Kamareddy Depot and he failed to report to the depot even on the date of the filing of the counter-affidavit before the Labour Court. The APSRTC also pleaded that the institution of the I.D eleven years after the petitioner ceased in the active service of the APSRTC, was a conduct that disentitled him to relief on account of inordinate laches and delay.

The Labour Court by the Award impugned in this writ petition *inter alia* held that the petitioner is not entitled to raise an I.D eleven years after the cause of action had arisen and also held that the petitioner failed to satisfy the Labour Court that he complied with the orders of his posting, whereby he was posted to Kamareddy Depot. Accordingly, the claim was rejected.

Except reiterating the contentions urged before the Labour Court and stating that the petitioner had made numerous representations to the APSRTC since 1985, the petitioner is unable to satisfy this Court that the delay in his approach to the Labour Court was on account of satisfactory reasons. It is too well settled that successive representations made to administrative authorities would not *ipso facto* constitute reasonable grounds for condonation of extreme delay and laches. Even the Labour Court should be approached with a reasonable amount of diligence, for which there is no evidence, as rightly found by the Labour Court.

On the above analysis, the writ petition is without merits and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

08-09-2005.

Lrkm.